

WISCONSIN WORKS (W-2) CONTRACT AND IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

201 E. Washington Avenue, GEF 1, Room 400X
Madison, WI 53707

Friday, October 20, 2000

10:00 AM - 2:00 PM

MINUTES

The W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee is the single point of contact for feedback to the Department of Workforce Development on policy implementation related to W-2 agencies, and includes representation from the Wisconsin County Human Service Association (WCHSA), Urban Caucus counties, W-2 private agencies in Milwaukee County and the balance of state, and Tribal W-2 agencies.

COMMITTEE:

Members (Present = X)

X Jennifer Noyes..... DES/AO
William B. Adams Racine County
Jon Angeli..... Southwest Consortium
X Phyllis A. Bermingham..... Marathon County
X Doris Green OIC
Tina Koehn UMOs
James Nitz..... Kaiser Group
Laverne Plucinski..... Bad River Chippewa
Jewel Reichert Fond du Lac County
Shirley Ross..... La Crosse County
Sara Shackleton Dane County
X Jerry Stepaniak..... MAXIMUS
Julia Taylor..... YW Works
X Michael Van Dyke Door County
X Glynis Underwood..... ESI

Alternates (Present = X)

Jan Alft Marathon County
Linda Brandenburg..... ESI
Cheryl Cobb UMOs
X Mona Garland OIC
X Deb Hughes Southwest Consortium
X Edward Kamin III..... Kenosha County
Richard L. Kammerud Polk County
X James Krivsky..... Racine County
X Barbara Metoxen..... Oneida Nation
Tom Miller La Crosse County
X Teresa Pierce..... Workforce Connections,
Inc
Rita Renner YW Works
Chris Schmitz..... Fond du Lac County

State Staff

Attendees:

Kevin Huggins, BFS
Karen Viegut, BWSP
Jude Morse, BDS
Rose Lynch, ASD
Alice Wilkins, BWSP
Howard Bernstein, DWD/OLC

Barbara Harris, BFS
Tim Hineline, BWSP
Victoria Carreon, LFB
Lynn Schmitt, BWSP
Paul Saeman, DES
Nancy Buckwalter, BDS

Guests:

Tim Cowan, YW Works
Kathryn Ryan, Dodge Co.
Jane Batha, Curtis & Associates
Kay Krenzke, ESI

Mike Harry, Walworth Co.
Adelene Robinson, Kenosha Co.
Margaret Romens, Dane Co.
William Martin, ESI

Recorder:

Stephen Dow, W-2 Contract and Implementation Committee Coordinator

Minutes Approval

A motion was made by Ms. Hughes to approve the October, 2000 minutes and seconded by Mr. Kamin. Motion carried.

Issue/Discussion: Monthly 24-Month Extension Report

The report was unavailable at the time of the meeting but has since been shared electronically with members and put on the Committee's web site.

Issue/Discussion: Monthly Training Update Report, Gerry Mayhew, DES/BFS/Training Section

The report was distributed without comment.

Issue/Discussion: Monthly CARES Update Report, Tim Hinline, DES/BWSP/CARES Section

The report was distributed. Mr. Hinline reported that problems with the EOS CARES report system are continuing.

He also reported that, because the extract files were run with a bad date, some of the point-in-time reports agencies rely on will have to be re-run; agencies will be alerted by DXBM when that is done.

Ms. Lynch reported that the CARES contract will expire at the end of 2001; however, the Governor has been asked to extend it to the end of 2002. The timelines for a new contract are still in draft; however, an request for proposal (RFP) will probably be out in April, 2001, followed by as much as a year of review. DWD will need a review panel and, as part of that panel, it is asking this committee to identify volunteers to participate on the panel. The group will begin in November and continue until the review is completed. The review will be of the vendor proposals and may include on-site visits. Participants should plan for 4 hours per month to begin. A representative from C&I is requested; the Income Maintenance Advisory Committee (IMAC) has also been asked for a representative. Ms. Noyes will work with Ms. Cobb regarding a survey. Ms. Hughes suggested a representative from the Wisconsin chapter of the National Eligibility Workers Association (NEW) be asked, also.

Issue/Discussion: CARES Plans

Mr. Hinline distributed the listing of Service Level Agreements (SLA) prepared for DES work with CARES. This listing was distributed to members of the IMAC the previous day. Mr. Hinline asked members to review the priorities given the work items and respond to him by November 3.

Ms. Hughes asked if there was any plan to provide the public with access to the listing of child care providers that, for other reasons, will be part of CARES. Mr. Hinline responded that he was unaware of the long range plans in this regard; Ms. Hughes commented that, in a past employment, she was aware of such software that might be of assistance in this and would provide the information she could on this to Mr. Hinline.

Ms. Hughes also noted an error on page 3, item 11 where the date 2010 should be 2001. She also asked about the use of the term "non-eligibility" when discussing Welfare to Work (WtW) and Workforce Attachment & Advancement (WAA). Mr. Hinline agreed the term was confusing, but only indicated that eligibility for these programs was not CARES-determined.

Issue/Discussion: TANF Update

Ms. Noyes reported meetings are ongoing in DES and with the Secretary's Office. The final steps in finishing the 40 descriptive papers have begun. A more complete report will be possible in November's meeting.

Ms. Hughes asked when the preliminary amounts for 2002/2003 would be available; Ms. Noyes responded that her estimate is next spring.

Ms. Bermingham asked if there was a TANF reauthorization web site running yet; Ms. Noyes responded that we aren't aware of one yet. Ms. Bermingham also asked if there was a date yet for the February update meeting; Ms. Noyes said it had not yet been determined but she expected that would be done by the first of the month.

Issue/Discussion: Community Reinvestment Update

Ms. Wilkins reported that DES staff reviewed the local CR plans on October 10 and 11 and hope to finish on October 24. More than 50 plans from that many agencies have been reviewed; many have multiple parts. Most plans are well written but some are missing information; regional office area administrators (AAs) will address the missing materials with the appropriate agencies. Ms. Wilkins said there were 2 concerns:

- (1) some reports were too brief and did not adequately report what was going to be done or how implemented. The plan need not have too much detail, but did need the "who, how, when and how much" type detail.
- (2) it was not always clear that services offered were actually going to working families.

Agencies were encouraged to wait for their regional offices to contact them with the approval/rejection responses.

Mr. VanDyke asked if agencies can deobligate CR dollars. Ms. Noyes said her immediate response was "no", but that she would research this to be certain.

Issue/Discussion: Community Reinvestment Guide

Mr. Dow reported that work had begun to assemble all the individual instructions and that a further update would be made in the November meeting, hopefully with a draft at that time.

Issue/Discussion: Performance Standards

Mr. Saeman reported that the modifications in performance measurements discussed in the last meeting have had, for some agencies, a substantial impact. A significant change was seen in the change of the denominator related to late disenrollments and regional transfers.

Representatives from W-2 agencies in Milwaukee requested a continuance of the moratorium on transfers to early 2001. There is anticipation of some 700 cases coming from the county agency. Ms. Noyes responded that answers to that issue should be arrived at the following week.

Ms. Underwood asked if dead and arrested participants should be reported for exception. Mr. Saeman responded that performance requirements were not set at 100% just because those situations were anticipated, but that there was nothing to deny submitting those cases. However, the exception request would not be considered unless they would have some impact for the agency's measurements. Ms. Noyes also responded, saying that if an agency had an accumulation of such cases, and reporting them would impact the measurements, then they certainly should be submitted. She reported that she did not want issues be those of data.

Ms. Pierce asked if those who subsequently receive SSI will be removed; Ms. Noyes and Mr. Saeman responded that yes, they would be removed. Mr. Saeman added that DES staff are working on a method for removing those participants from the count, although those who entered employment would be left.

Ms. Romens asked if another 30 days could be added for reporting on the 2 standards beyond when data is available. Ms. Noyes answered yes. In further discussion, Ms. Noyes agreed that the deadline would be extended to January 1, 2001, for all the standards. This modification will be communicated to all agencies via their regional office Area Administrators.

Ms. Hughes asked if there was going to be access by local agencies to the denominator lists. Ms. Noyes and Mr. Saeman reported there would be and that access was hoped to be available by the end of the following week through their regional office contacts. Mr. Cowan asked if the reports could be modified so that either the PIN or the participant names would be on the report, but not both.

Issue/Discussion: DHFS/DWD Memo of Understanding (MOU) re Medical Assistance

Ms. Buckwalter reviewed the MOU with members and asked that on the draft Administrator's Memo with the MOU be sent her by October 27.

At Mr. Nitz's request, Ms. Noyes briefly summarized the MOU and Administrator's Memo, explaining that the affects of the MOU are more on the state agencies than local operations. Mr. VanDyke commented that a danger is in the provision of conflicting information to local staff from the two departments; Ms. Noyes responded that the MOU is intended to address and reduce such instances.

Issue/Discussion: Dispute Resolution

Mr. Bernstein solicited information from members about the functioning of the present W-2 Fact Finding process, asking for any statistics the agencies may have as well as any anecdotal information they would be willing to share. The same request will be made of all agencies through the regional offices. His intent is to determine the success, failures, speed, fairness, and problems of the present process. Responses should be addressed directly to Mr. Bernstein or through the regional office contact by the end of November.

Issue/Discussion: Best Practices

There were no items in this category during the meeting.

Issue/Discussion: OTHER –

Mr. Martin asked the agency's responsibilities when it had secured a restraining order keeping the participant away from the office. Mr. Bernstein responded that for an entitlement program, the participant must be provided alternative means for service contacts, including a secure site for the participant and employee. However, for a non-entitlement program, it may be that program participation is ended; this would be a case-by-case judgement. In any event, DWD fully supports a zero tolerance danger policy and supports the assurance of employee safety. Ms. Bermingham reported that her agency requests advanced notice of the participant's appearance in such instances, and refuses unless sufficient safety is available.

Mr. VanDyke asked why there is so much interest in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act just now. Ms. Noyes responded that she would followup.

Mr. Dow explained that an attempt to have someone knowledgeable on the Job Services Bureau reorganization was made but no one was available. The Bureau Director, Leonor Rosas, will attend in November. Ms. Rosas did not believe any impact on the W-2 agency practices or funding will result.

Mr. VanDyke asked if Ms. Noyes was aware of any reactions Secretary Reinert had to members' responses to her recent correspondence. Ms. Noyes responded that Ms. Reinert understood the members' reactions and hoped to move forward. The Secretary has received several additional written and oral reactions and Ms. Noyes assumed a response to the letter from Dave Titus was done or would be shortly.

Members asked about the progress of the 60-month workgroup. A very brief update was given; an agenda item will be made for the November meeting for further update.

Several members commented that they appreciated the budget updates and wanted to continue that item as a regular agenda item. Ms. Noyes supposed a more extensive discussion could be made in November when more information would be available.

Mr. Nitz asked about the Hudson Institute's study on caseloads and the impact on the 50/55 agency distribution. Ms. Noyes responded that IMAC also was greatly interested in this subject. The issues are very complicated; there is more to the issue than has been studied so far. Mr. Nitz said agencies are concerned as the issue affects agency infrastructure for 2002 and beyond. Mr. Kamin suggested we compare members' concerns with those of IMAC's; Ms. Noyes said this might be a good way of focusing our efforts. Members are to identify their 5 major concerns to Mr. Kamin by October 27.

NEXT MEETING DATE: November 17, 2000
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
125 South Webster
GEF III, Room 041
Madison, WI